

WRITTEN TECHNICAL REPORT – Feedback & Marking

Weighting: 70%

Student: Isaac Wilmore

ID: 2519409

Capped to 40% =28/70

Engagement with Literature Skills (15 marks)

Mark: 9 / 15

Isaac demonstrates some engagement with relevant safety literature, including Reason (1990), Leveson (2012), Dekker (2014), and ICAO guidance. These sources are appropriate for analysing a major aviation accident. However, the use of literature is largely descriptive. The report summarises theories such as the Swiss Cheese Model and STAMP but does not critically compare or evaluate different perspectives. Several references are also poorly formatted, incomplete, or contain errors (e.g. inconsistent author names, missing publication details), which weakens academic credibility.

What was done well

- Appropriate choice of key safety and human-factors sources.
- Clear explanation of major accident models.

What must improve

- Move beyond description into comparison and evaluation.
- Improve academic referencing accuracy and consistency.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a comparison table contrasting Swiss Cheese, STAMP, and CRM and how each explains the Tenerife disaster.

Knowledge & Understanding Skills (25 marks)

Mark: 14 / 25

The report shows a basic understanding of human factors, communication failure, and organisational influence in accidents. However, knowledge remains generalised and is not applied with sufficient technical depth. The analysis is mostly historical and narrative, with very limited engineering or operational detail. Concepts such as severity, occurrence, detection, and RPN are mentioned but not quantitatively applied.

What was done well

- Correct identification of key contributing factors.
- Reasonable understanding of CRM and communication issues.

What must improve

- Apply risk analysis concepts numerically and technically.
- Introduce engineering risk management language and structure.

Suggested enhancement

- Include a risk table with Severity, Occurrence, Detection and calculated RPN for each major failure.

Cognitive & Intellectual Skills (20 marks)

Mark: 11 / 20

There is some attempt at analysis, particularly in linking authority gradient and communication failure. However, the work is mainly explanatory rather than analytical. Claims are often asserted without being evaluated or prioritised. There is no evidence of structured decision-making or critical justification.

What was done well

- Logical description of how multiple failures interacted.

What must improve

- Demonstrate prioritisation of risks.
- Justify conclusions with structured reasoning.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a before/after comparison table showing how safety barriers failed and how they would be strengthened.

Practical Application Skills (20 marks)

Mark: 10 / 20

The case study is relevant but the application is weak from an engineering perspective. The report reads more like a history essay than a technical RCA. There is no formal RCA table, no engineering risk assessment, no process modelling, and no evidence of practical implementation strategy.

What was done well

- Appropriate real-world case selection.

What must improve

- Introduce engineering tools: RCA table, process mapping, quantitative risk evaluation.
- Provide practical corrective actions beyond narrative description.

Suggested enhancement

- Add a formal RCA table and a process flow diagram of airport operations.

Transferable Skills for Professional Practice (20 marks)

Mark: 12 / 20

Structure is acceptable, but academic quality is weakened by:

- frequent grammatical errors,
- spelling mistakes,
- inconsistent formatting,
- poor referencing.

Professional presentation does not yet meet expected standard.

What was done well

- Logical report structure.
- Clear section headings.

What must improve

- Proofreading.
- Academic tone and technical precision.

Written Report Total

Category	Mark
Literature	9 / 15
Knowledge & Understanding	14 / 25
Cognitive Skills	11 / 20
Practical Application	10 / 20
Transferable Skills	12 / 20
Total	56 / 100

Weighted contribution (70%) = 39.2 / 70

capped to 40% due to submitted late = 28/70